IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 10674 OF 2004
WITH
WRIT PETITION NOS.10683 & 10684 OF 2004, 861, 879, 881, 882, 988, 989, & 990 OF 2005.

W.P. No.10674, 10683 & 10684/04:

Anil V. Deshmukh. ...Petitioner.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....
W.P. No.861/05:

Hiru B.Patil since deceased through
Legal heirs: Dattatraya H.Patil. ...Petitioner.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....
W.P. No.879 & 881/05:

Janu S. Patil (Rane) & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....
W.P. No.882/05:

Jaganath W. Rane since deceased
through his legal heirs:
Ranendra J.Rane & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....
W.P. No.879 & 881/05:

Janu S. Patil (Rane) & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....

W.P. No.988/05:

Baban R.Rane & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....

W.P. No.989/05:

Sambhaji K. Rane & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....

W.P. No.990/05:

Padmakar R.Rane & Ors. ...Petitioners.
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents.
....

Mr. R.D. Soni i/b. M/s. Ram & Co. for the Petitioners.
Mr. Y. D. Mulani, AGP for the Respondents.
.....

CORAM : DALVEER BHANDARI, C.J. &
DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J.

April 19, 2005.

P.C.:

All these petitions are being disposed of by this common order.

2. Rule. Mr. Y. D. Mulani, learned Assistant Government Pleader, waives service of Rule on behalf of the State. By consent, Rule is made returnable forthwith and taken up for hearing.

3. By these petitions, the Petitioners are seeking a very limited relief whereby the Petitioners' applications, which are pending before the second Respondent - Collector, Raigad – under Section 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (“the Act', for short), may be decided expeditiously. It appears that pertaining to the same notification, which covers the lands involved in these petitions, on 6th December, 2000, the Reference Court has granted enhanced compensation. Based on the same, applications were filed under Section 28-A of the Act in February, 2001, which are within the prescribed period of ninety days.

4. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we direct Respondent No.2 – Collector, Raigad – to decide the said applications for enhancement of compensation under Section 28-A of the Act as expeditiously as possible, preferably within three months from the date of receipt of this order. While doing so, the second Respondent shall take into account the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India and Ors. v. Mangatu Ram,** reported in AIR 1997 SC 2704, which is annexed as Exhibit 'B' to the petitions.

5. No further directions are necessary. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. The Writ Petitions are, accordingly, disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

DR.D.Y.CHANDRACHUD, J.